IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Sharon Denise Brailsford,)	C/A No.: 1:18-321-SVH
)	
Plaintiff,)	
VS.)	
)	ORDER
Nancy A. Berryhill, Deputy)	
Commissioner of Social Security,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

This matter is before the court on the motion of Plaintiff's counsel for fees. [ECF No. 20]. On February 13, 2019, the court reversed the Commissioner's decision that had denied Plaintiff's claim for social security disability benefits and remanded the case for further administrative proceedings pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). [ECF No. 18]. Plaintiff then properly filed and documented a request for fees, costs, and expenses pursuant to the Equal Access to Justice Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2412 ("the EAJA"), totaling \$6,523.72 for fees and \$16.26 in expenses. On May 13, 2019, the parties filed a stipulation indicating the parties had negotiated Plaintiff's claim for EAJA fees and stipulated to an award of \$6,198 for fees and \$16.26 in expenses. [ECF No. 20]. Accordingly, the court grants the motion, as amended by the parties' stipulation and directs the Commissioner to pay Plaintiff \$6,214.26. Such payment shall constitute a complete release from and bar to any and all further claims that Plaintiff may have under the EAJA to fees, costs, and expenses incurred in connection with disputing the Commissioner's decision. This award is without prejudice to the rights of Plaintiff's counsel to seek attorney fees under section 206(b) of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 406(b), subject to the offset provisions of the EAJA.

Under Astrue v. Ratliff, 130 S. Ct. 2521, 2528–29 (2010), EAJA fees awarded by this court belong to Plaintiff and are subject to offset under the Treasury Offset Program (31 U.S.C. § 3716(c)(3)(B) (2006)). Therefore, the court orders the EAJA fees to be paid to Plaintiff.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

June 3, 2019 Columbia, South Carolina Shiva V. Hodges United States Magistrate Judge

Shira V. Hodges